

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed May 30, 2008. Claims 16-35 are pending in the application. Claims 16, 17, 21-27, 29 and 31-35 are rejected and claims 18-20, 28 and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants respond to the Office Action as follows.

**Response to Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claim 17 as amended recites engaging the inner portion of a clamp through a slot between flange segments of a clamping interface and removing the clamp. As amended, claim 17 is proper under 35 U.S.C. §112 and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Response to Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 16, 17, 21-27, 29 and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ng, U.S. Patent No. 7,215,509. Claim 31 is rejected above, however, on page 5, ¶7 of the Office Action, claim 31 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form. Clarification regarding claim 31 is respectfully requested. Claims 16, 24 and 34 are cancelled and claim 35 as amended is dependent upon claim 28, which was indicated to be allowable on page 5, ¶ 7 of the Office Action.

Claim 21 is independent and claims 17, 23, 25, 27, 29 and 32-33 dependent therefrom. Dependent, claim 17 is rejected above under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), however, on page 5, ¶ 6 of the Office Action, it states that claim 17 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as set forth above. Clarification regarding claim 17 is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 as amended recites supplying an outward force in a first direction via contacting engagement with an assembly tool against an inner portion of the clamp to enlarge an opening defined by the clamp and supplying a clamping force in a second direction different from the first direction to disengage the inner portion of the clamp from an assembly tool as claimed. In

the Office Action, it states that “Ng teaches a process of clamping storage media comprising steps of: supplying an outward force in a first direction (194, Y-direction) to an inner portion (154) of a clamp (200); and supplying a clamping force in a second direction (196, X-direction) different from the first direction to install the clamp over a flange of a clamping interface (138) as shown in Figs. 7-12 (see also col. 7, line 13 col. 8, line 38)”. Col. 7, lines 13-37 of Ng disclose a tool 188 that includes a deflection portion 190 and a retention portion 192. The deflection portion 190 operates along the Y-axis 194. Operation of the deflection portion 190 along the Y axis 194 facilitates deflection of the peripheral portion 142 of a clamp 136. The retention portion 192 operates along an X-axis 196 to either retain or release a disc clamp 136 from the mounting tool 188. As disclosed in Ng, the retention portion 192 holds the tool engagement region 198 of the disc clamp 136 in a fixed position, while the deflection portion 190 of the mounting tool 188 applies a deflection force to the peripheral portion 142 to enlarge the mounting aperture of the disc clamp 136. (Col. 7, lines 33-37)

Assuming that the deflection portion 190 of Ng supplies a force in a first direction (or Y-direction) to an inner portion 154 of a clamp, Ng does not teach nor suggest the step of supplying a clamping force in a second direction different from the first direction to disengage the inner portion of the clamp from an assembly tool to install the clamp over a flange of a clamping interface as claimed. In Ng, retention portion 192 moves along X-axis 196 to retain or release an outer edge of the clamp and does not supply a clamping force in a second direction different from the first direction to disengage an inner portion of the clamp to install the clamp over a flange of a clamping interface as claimed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 17, 23, 25, 27, 29 and 32-33 are dependent upon amended claim 21 and are allowable *inter alia* based upon their dependency on claim 21.

Further, claim 23 was rejected on the basis that in Ng, the “inner portion of the clamp is engaged along a sloped surface of assembly tool 192 to supply the outward force to the inner portion prior to supplying the clamping force as shown in FIG. 7”. As shown in FIG. 7, assembly tool 192 initially moves along the X-axis to retain and release the clamp. Amended claim 23 recites

the outward force is supplied in a first direction consistent with claim 21. It is the Examiner's position that the outward force in the first direction is supplied along the Y-axis 194 via deflection portion 190. (Office Action, ¶5). Assuming that the outward force is supplied along the Y-axis 194 via deflection portion 190, then the assembly tool 192 of Ng does not teach nor suggest a sloped surface to supply the outward force in the first direction prior to supplying the clamping force in the second direction (or x-direction 196) as set forth in ¶5 of the Office Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 29 is dependent upon claim 21 and recites supplying the outward force to the inner portion of the clamp prior to supplying the clamping force. Claim 29 was rejected based upon FIGS. 8-9 of Ng. FIG. 8 of Ng shows the mounting tool 188 in a raised position and a clamp in a maximum deflection angle and in FIG. 9, the retention portion 192 and tool are lowered proximate to the storage media 110. Assuming that the clamping force is supplied via movement of retention portion 192 along the X-axis as interpreted with respect to claim 21 (Office Action, page 3, ¶5) retention portion 192 moves along the x-axis to retain the clamp as shown in FIG. 7 prior to application of deflection force shown in FIG. 8. Thus assuming that the outward force is supplied via deflection portion 190 as shown in FIG. 8, then the outward force is supplied following retention of clamp in direction 196. Ng does not teach nor suggest supplying an outward force to an inner portion of the clamp prior to supplying a clamping force as claimed.

Claim 32 is rejected based upon Ng without reference to the structure of Ng that teaches each of the recited claim elements. Thus, the rejection fails to set forth a *prima facie* basis to reject the claim.

Claim 26 is amended to independent form and recites supplying an outward force in a first direction to an inner portion of a clamp via an assembly tool and releasing the clamp from the assembly tool by supplying a clamping force in a second direction towards a clamping interface where the second direction is different from the first direction to install the clamp in a recessed groove of the clamping interface. In Ng, retention portion 192 retains and release a disc clamp and deflection portion 190 facilitates deflection of the peripheral portion 142 to engage the mounting aperture 140 of the clamp. Assuming that clamping force is supplied via retention portion 192 along

the X-axis as set forth in ¶ 5 of the Office Action, then Ng teaches that the retention portion 192 moves away from (FIG. 11) and not towards the clamping interface to release the clamp. Ng does not teach supplying an outward force in a first direction to the inner portion of the clamp and releasing the clamp from an assembly tool by supplying the clamping force in a second direction towards the clamping interface, where the second direction is different from the first direction to install the clamp in a recessed groove of the clamping interface as claimed. Claim 22 is dependent upon claim 26 and is allowable *inter alia* based upon the allowability of claim 26.

#### **Response to Allowable subject Matter**

Claim 17 is indicated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph as discussed above. Claim 17 as amended is proper under 35 U.S.C. §112, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-20, 28, and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 28 is amended to independent form and allowance of claim 28 and dependent claims 31 and 35 is respectfully requested. Claim 20 is cancelled and claims 18-19 are dependent upon claim 21. Allowance of claims 18-19 is respectfully requested.

Claim 30 is cancelled and new claims 36-40 are added. Favorable consideration of new claims 36-40 is respectfully requested.

#### **Amendments to the Specification**

The specification has been amended so that the references to the FIGS. in the specification are consistent with the nomenclature used in the drawings. The specification has also been amended to correct typographical errors. Entry of the amendments to the specification is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,  
WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Deirdre Megley Kvale/  
Deirdre Megley Kvale, Reg. No. 35,612  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

DMK:rev